

REMARKS

The present non-final Office Action was mailed on August 13, 2003. A Petition for Extension of Time of One Month was filed on November 18, 2003, along with an IDS, thereby extending the due date for responding to the present Office Action to December 13, 2003. A Petition for an additional one month extension of time is filed concurrently herewith, thereby extending the due date to January 13, 2004. Applicant's undersigned representative hereby authorizes any other fee which may be required to maintain the pendency of this application to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-2372.

As an initial matter, Applicant, and Applicant's representatives, Robert Westerlund and Bruce Bernstein, would like to thank SPE T. Lee and Examiner Peyton for the courtesies they extended during the Personal Examiner Interview, which was held on December 3, 2003.

Claims 116-151 are currently pending in the present application, original claims 1-115 having been canceled by way of the Preliminary Amendment filed on March 7, 2003. Claims 119, 123-124, 126, 131, 135-136, 138, 140-148, and 150-151 are amended herein. The amendments to claims 119, 126, 131, 138, and 143 are made to correct minor typographical errors. The amendment to independent claim 140 is made to more positively recite certain aspects of the invention. The amendments to dependent claims 123-124, 135-136, 141-148, and 150-151 are made to conform these dependent claims to the respective amended claims from which they depend, and/or improve the form of the claims. Claims 152-175 are newly added herein in order to more positively recite certain features of the present invention in varying scope.

The instant Office Action rejects claims 119, 131, and 143 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, on the grounds that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the recited limitation "the second first fixed content." By this Amendment, Applicant has amended these rejected claims to correct the typographical error, *i.e.*, to change "the second first fixed content" to "the second fixed content." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 119, 131, and 143 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph.

The instant Office Action rejects claims 116-118, 122-130, 134-142, and 146-151 under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 5,559,936 ("Poulter"). The instant Office Action rejects claims 119-121, 131-133, and 143-145 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Poulter. Applicant respectfully traverses these prior art rejections of claims 116-151 for the reasons discussed during the above-referenced Personal Examiner Interview, as summarized below. Applicant further respectfully submits that newly-added claims 152-175 are patentably distinguishable over Poulter for the reasons discussed during the above-referenced Personal Examiner Interview, as summarized below.

With regard to independent claims 116 and 128, in Poulter, no computer executable software is included on the same portable storage media that includes the fixed content, as claimed. Rather, the portable storage media in Poulter only contains fixed content. Further, in Poulter, there is only one remote *content* source, namely the "Master Data Source" shown in Fig. 2 of the Poulter reference, and, therefore, Poulter does not teach or suggest first and second remote content sources as claimed..

With regard to newly-added independent claim 152, that claim recites a "first portable storage medium" that includes both "a first computer executable software application" and "computer executable software" that enables the client computer to obtain updates for the first computer executable software application and a second, different computer executable software application over the Internet via a server-based update distribution service. Plainly, Poulter does not disclose or even suggest these features.

The only other independent claim presented herein, claim 140, as amended herein, is directed to a user station that includes programmed logic that enables a user at the user station to access fixed content from each of a plurality of portable storage media, together with respective remote content from one or more remote content sources, via a user interface. Claim 140 further recites that, for each of the storage media, the user interface is customized with respect to the fixed content stored on the portable storage medium when the user accesses the fixed content stored on the storage medium. Plainly, Poulter does not disclose or even suggest these features.

Based on the above and foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 116-151 as being unpatentable over Poulter under 35 USC § 102(e) and 103(a), and respectfully requests early allowance of claims 116-175, as presented herein.

Although Applicant believes that this application is now in final condition for allowance, if the examiner believes there are any further issues that remain to be resolved, the examiner is encouraged to call Applicant's undersigned representative prior to taking any further formal action in this case.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert A. Westerlund

Reg. No. 31,439

WESTERLUND · POWELL, P.C.
100 Daingerfield Rd., Suite 100
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-2886
Phone: (703) 706-5862
Fax : (703) 706-5860

Date: December 16, 2003

Attorney Docket No.: RRR-00-007US